**REMARKS**

Applicant, his principal representatives in Germany, and the undersigned have carefully reviewed the Final Office Action of January 26, 2007 in the subject U.S. patent application, together with the prior art cited and relied on in the rejections of the claims. In response, a Request for Continued Examination is being filed, together with the present Second Amendment. It is believed that the claims now pending in the subject U.S. patent application are patentable over the prior art cited and relied on by the Examiner in the final rejections of claims. Reexamination and reconsideration of the application, and allowance of the claims, is respectfully requested.

In the Amendment filed November 7, 2006 in the subject U.S. patent application, the undersigned included a discussion, starting at the first full paragraph of page 10, of the method of control of the rollers in a dampening agent application roller train to which the subject invention is directed. That discussion concluded midway on page 12 of the Amendment. The Examiner is respectfully urged to again review that discussion because it is important to a full understanding of the claimed method. As set forth in currently amended claim 102, there are several aspects of the subject invention which should be kept in mind during a consideration of the subject invention and the prior art. Initially, there are provided first and second rollers in the dampening agent roller train. The first one of these rollers receives the dampening agent and passes it directly to the second roller. Each one of these two rollers is driven by its own separate drive motor. In other words, the first roller is provided with a first drive motor and the second roller is provided with a second drive motor. Each drive motor drives its respective roller independently of the other roller. The forme cylinder, which will ultimately receive the

dampening agent, is provided with its own drive motor and is driven by that drive motor at a forme cylinder surface speed of rotation. Each of the first and second drive motors and the forme cylinder drive motor is controlled independently. The second roller is rotated at a second roller surface speed which is greater than a surface speed of the first roller. As a result, there is formed a slippage between the first and second rollers. That slippage is formed by the controlling of each of the first and second motors independently. The slippage of the two rollers is controlled as a function of the surface speed of the forme cylinder. The result is that an amount of dampening agent which is supplied to the forme cylinder, is set by controlling the slippage between the first and second rollers as a function of the surface speed of the forme cylinder.

In the Final Office Action of January 26, 2007, claims 102, 103, 105, 106, 108, 110, 111, 114-116, 118, 121, 122 and 127 were rejected over the previously cited Japanese document No. JP01-232045 to Tsuneo in view of the newly cited U.S. patent No 3,688,694 to Preuss. Claim 109 was rejected as being unpatentable over Tsuneo in view of Preuss, and further in view of U.S. patent No. 5,101,724 to D'Heureuse. Claims 104, 112, 117, 119 and 120 were rejected over Tsuneo in view of Preuss and further in view of applicant's admitted prior art (AAPA). Claim 123 was rejected over Tsuneo in view of Preuss and further in view of U.S. patent No. 6,314,878 to Wolff. Claims 107 and 124-126 were rejected over Tsuneo in view of Preuss and further in view of U.S. patent No. 6,138,563 to Sone.

The Tsuneo reference was cited and relied on in the prior Office Action of August 7, 2006 as anticipating a number of the claims then pending in the application. In response, several of the claims then pending were amended. It was also pointed out in

the prior Amendment of November 7, 2006 that the Tsuneo reference fails to fairly teach or suggest several essential aspects of the method in accordance with the present invention. Such failings in the teachings of Tsuneo are acknowledged by the Examiner in the Final Office Action, at page 3 thereof. Tsuneo is admitted as failing to teach:

that the second roller is rotated at a speed greater than the first roller;

that there is a slippage between the first roller and the second roller; and

that the first and second drive motors are used or controlled as a function of an operating condition of the forme cylinder.

The secondary reference to Preuss is cited and relied on as providing the teachings of claim 102 and others, that are missing from the Tsuneo reference. The undersigned respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's assertions for several reasons.

In the Preuss patent, No. 3,688,694 there is shown a dampening device for a printing press. As may be seen in Fig. 1, a fountain roller 5, which corresponds to the first roller of claim 102, is adapted to receive a dampening agent from a source of that agent. An intermediate roller 6 is in direct contact with the fountain roller 5 and would thus be the second roller of claim 102. It is initially to be noted that Preuss shows three different drive mechanisms for the intermediate roller 6 and several different drive mechanisms for the fountain roller 5. None of those indicate a second drive motor for driving the second roller independently of the first roller. In Fig. 2, the fountain roller 5 is driven by a drive belt 35 from the transfer roller 7. Fountain roller 5 drives the intermediate roller 6 through a gear arrangement indicated at 36. In Figs. 4 and 5, the intermediate roller 6 is driven by a gear train directly from the transfer roller 7. Thus,

Preuss does not disclose, or suggest the provision of a second drive motor for driving the second roller independently of the first roller.

In the Preuss reference there is a discussion of the registration of slippage between the fountain roller 5 and the transfer roller 7, not the intermediate roller 6. Such a teaching is not relevant to the subject invention, as recited in currently amended claim 102. This slippage can be accurately regulated, as recited at Column 1, lines 61-63. Preuss then states that reduction of the slippage greatly improves the uniformity of the flow of dampening agent. That is a different object than the one to be attained by the present invention, as recited in currently amended claim 102.

As recited at the top of Column 2 of Preuss, an intermediate roller 6 is provided between the fountain roller 5 and the transfer roller 7. If the intermediate roller 6 of Preuss has a speed which is greater than that of the fountain roller 5, a total slippage is divided into a first slippage between the fountain roller 5 and the intermediate roller 6, and a second slippage between the intermediate roller 6 and the transfer roller 7.

Preuss does recite that a speed differential between the fountain roller 5 and the intermediate roller 6 is adjustable by selection of proper gearing. However, that is not the same as the provision of a second drive motor to drive the second roller, and the controlling of each of the first roller, second roller and forme cylinder drive motors independently, as recited in currently amended claim 102.

Preuss recites the provision of an independent drive for the fountain roller, at Column 2, lines 39 and 40. This independent drive, for only the fountain roller, can be controlled as a function of the dampening fluid required by the press at different press operating speeds, as recited at Column 2, lines 39-46. However, this selection of the

speed of the fountain roller 5, as a function of the speed of the forme cylinder 3 does not carry forward to a control of an independent drive motor for the intermediate roller 6 to provide a slippage which is a function of the rotational speed of the forme cylinder and which slippage is used for setting an amount of the dampening fluid supplied to the forme cylinder, all in accordance with the method recited in currently amended claim 102. In fact, Preuss teaches away from the method of currently amended claim 102. Preuss recites that with the exception of the fountain roll, all of the other rolls are driven with the circumferential speed of the plate cylinder, as recited at Column 3, lines 51 and 52.

Claim 102, as currently amended, recites that the slippage between the first and second roller results from a selection of the speeds of both of the first and second rollers, by operation of their two respective independent drive motors. The speeds of each of these two rollers are thus controllable independently of each other. Any speed for either of the two rollers can be selected so long as the speed of the second is greater than the speed of the first. The slippage that results from these speed selections is a function of the surface speed of the forme cylinder. The actual speeds of the first and second rollers, as recited in currently amended claim 102 are completely independent of the speed of the forme cylinder. The slippage between the first and second cylinder is adjustable and it is not necessary to select a specific speed for either roller, so long as the second is greater than the first. The amount of dampening agent supplied to the forme cylinder is set by controlling the slippage between the first and second rollers, as a function of the surface speed of the forme cylinder. The combination of Preuss with Tsuneo fails to teach or suggest this method for controlling rollers in a dampening agent application roller chain. Thus, currently amended claim

102 is believed to be patentable over this combination of prior art advanced by the Examiner.

All of the rest of the claims currently pending in the subject U.S. patent application depend, either directly or indirectly from believed allowable, currently amended claim 102. These dependent claims are thus also believed to be allowable. Claim 103 has been cancelled since its recited method steps have been added to presently amended, independent claim 102. Claim 105 has been amended to recite the step of setting both of first roller speed and the second roller speed as a function of the forme cylinders surface speed. This is clearly not shown, or suggested in the Tsuneo and Preuss references.

With respect to claim 106, the Examiner has admitted that the prior art references do not show, or suggest the setting of the slippage between the first and second rollers as a function of the amount of ink required. The Examiner enters into a fairly length explanation of why, in his opinion, the method step set forth in claim 106 would be obvious to one of skill in the art. It appears that the suggestion of the taking of several steps to attempt to arrive at the process recited in claim 106 is, of itself, evidence that the taking of such a plurality of steps would not be obvious to one of skill in the art, absent the teachings of the subject application.

With respect to the rejection of claim 121, it is respectfully submitted that the Tsuneo reference fails to teach or to suggest that there is any connection between the fountain roller 2, the transfer roller 3 and the water applying roller 4 of the clamping device 1, and the rollers 5, 6 and 7. It is assumed that those latter rollers are part of an inking device. Roller 6 is noted as being a foreign matter removing roller. There is no discussion in the Tsuneo abstract of either a bridge roller or an ink application roller

working with the forme cylinder and contacting a last roller in the roller chain of the dampening agent application roller train.

With respect to claim 114, that claim has been amended to recite the speeds of both of the first roller and the second roller are below that of the forme cylinder. Preuss specifically recites, at Column 5, lines 54 and 55 that the rolls 1, 7 and 6 all rotate with the same circumferential speed of the plate cylinder 3.

The secondary references to D'Heureuse, Wolff and Sone have been reviewed. None of them are believed to show the steps of the present method, as recited in currently amended claim 102 which are missing from the combination of Tsuneo and Preuss cited and relied on in the rejection of that claim. D'Heureuse teaches the use of a distributor roller in a dampening device. However, there is no teaching, or suggestion in D'Heureuse why its disclosed device would be brought into connection with a dampening device, as recited in currently amended, independent claim 102. Claim 102 recites drives for the first and second roller and specific adjustments for these drives. D'Heureuse does not teach or suggest any of these features.

The courtesies extended to the undersigned by Examiner Zimmerman during the telephone discussions held on April 24, 2007 are acknowledged and appreciated. Based on the Examiner's assertion, after his review of a telefaxed copy of the currently submitted claims, that they would raise new issues and would require additional searching, the filing of this Second Amendment, together with the accompanying Request for Continued Examination, is believed to be appropriate.

**SUMMARY**

A Request for Continued Examination (RCE) is being filed concurrently with the filing of this Second Amendment. Various ones of the claims pending in the application have been amended. Several have been cancelled and the rest have been carried forward. It is believed that all of the claims now pending in the subject application are patentable over the prior art cited and relied on, taken either singly or in combination. Allowance of the claims, and passage of the application to issue is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Claus August BOLZA-SCHÜNEMANN
Applicant

JONES, TULLAR & COOPER, P.C.
Attorneys for Applicant

Douglas R. Hanscom
Reg. No. 26, 600

April 26, 2007
JONES, TULLAR & COOPER, P.C.
P.O. Box 2266 Eads Station
Arlington, Virginia 22202
(703) 415-1500
Attorney Docket: W1.2041 PCT-US